UNITED STATES DISTRICT, COURT ED DISTRICT COURT

2004 JUN 14 P 1: 50

TIMOTHY L. LaFRENIER, Plaintiff)) v. MARY ANNE KINIREY, DANIEL MORRISON, William E. May and THE TOWN OF TOWNSEND

4-40114

L ACTION NO:

COMPLAINT

INTRODUCTION

The instant complaint alleges violations of 42 U.S.C. 1983, M.G.L. 112, 11 I, M.G.L. 258A, the common law, by the above defendants in connection to, among other things, the arrest, treatment, and prosecution of the plaintiff.

JURISDICTION

Jurisdiction is based upon 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343, and the pendant jurisdiction of this Court to entertain claims arising under state law.

PARTIES

- Plaintiff Timothy L. LaFrenier is a resident of Fitchburg and 3. the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.
- Defendant Mary Ann Kinirey was at all times relevant to this 4. Complaint, a duly appointed police officer employed by the Town of Townsend, acting under color of state law and is sued in her individual capacity.
- Defendant Daniel Morrison was at all times relevant to this Complaint, a duly appointed police officer employed by the Town of Townsend, acting under color of state law and is sued in his individual capacity.

RECEIPT# AMOUNT \$_ SUMMONS ISSUED LOCAL RULE 4.1. WAIVER FORM.

MCF ISSUED_

BY DPTY, CLK

- 6. Defendant Police Chief William E. May was at all times relevant to this Complaint, a duly appointed police officer employed by the Town of Townsend, acting under color of state law and is sued in his individual capacity.
- 7. Defendant Town of Townsend is a municipality duly incorporated under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

FACTS

- 8. On June 15, 2001, the plaintiff was driving from his workplace in Nashua, New Hampshire to a doctor's appointment. Feeling gravely ill, the plaintiff pulled his automobile over to the side of the road. He was on Route 13/Dudley Road in Townsend. A motorist went the Townsend Police Department and informed defendant Kinirey, and at least one other, that there was a motorist (who would be the plaintiff) on Route 13, north of the station, who "did not look well."
- 9. Defendant Kinirey acted on the motorist's account. Kinirey came upon the plaintiff's vehicle and engaged the plaintiff as he sat behind the wheel of his car.
- 10. After Kinirey, defendant Daniel Morrison responded to the scene.
- 11. Defendants Kinirey and Morrison arrested plaintiff LeFrenier for operating a motor vehicle under the influence of an intoxicating liquor in violation G. L. c. 90 §24D.
- 12. During the course of the plaintiff's arrest, defendants Kinirey and Morrison battered and bruised the plaintiff, inflicting various injuries, among them being one to his wrist and one to his jaw.
- 13. The plaintiff's arrest occurred early in the afternoon. Defendants Kinirey and Morrison did not witness the plaintiff driving his car. Defendants Kinirey and Morrison did not smell alcohol on the breath of the plaintiff or about the plaintiff. There was no alcohol in the plaintiff's car.
- 14. The plaintiff had consumed no alcohol on the day of his arrest.
- 15. After his arrest, the plaintiff was transported to the Townsend police station.

- 16. There he took a breathalyzer test. His reading on the test was 0.00 and 0.00.
- 17. The police took LeFrenier from the police station to the Hospital. At the hospital, the plaintiff was given a blood test. The test revealed that his blood was free of any illicit drugs.
- 18. The test of the plaintiff's blood revealed a white blood cell count indicative of a viral infection.
- 19. On June 18, 2001, a criminal complaint (0148 CR 963) issued against the Plaintiff. The complainant was defendant Morrison.
- 20. The plaintiff was not charged with operating under the influence of an intoxicating liquor.
- 21. The complaint alleged that on June 15, 2001 the plaintiff had committed the following crimes: (1) assault and battery on a police officer, defendant Kinirey, (2) assault and battery on a police officer, defendant Morrison, (3) being a disorderly person, and (4) resisting arrest.
- 22. Plaintiff LeFrenier did not assault and batter defendant Kinirey, as defendant Kinirey knew.
- 23. Plaintiff LeFrenier did not assault and batter defendant Morrison, as defendants Kinirey and Morrison knew.
- 24. Plaintiff LeFrenier was not a disorderly person, as defendant Kinirey knew.
- 25. Plaintiff LeFrenier did not resist arrest, as defendants Kinirey and Morrison knew.
- 26. On March 4, 2002, after a trial in the Ayer District Court, Plaintiff LeFrenier was found not guilty on all charges in the complaint brought by defendant Morrsion with the exception of the charge of assault and battery against Morrison; that charged was dismissed.
- 27. On March 5, 2002, defendant Kinirey applied to Registry of Motor Vehicles to have plaintiff LaFrenier's driver's license suspended. The RMV did not suspend LaFrenier's license.

First Count:

Violation of 42 U.S.C. 1983 by Defendants Kinirey and Morrison

- 28. The plaintiff restates and realleges the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 27and incorporates herein as paragraph 28.
- 29. By the actions described in paragraphs 1 through 27, the

defendants violated the plaintiff's constitutional rights as guaranteed by the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution as follows:

- a. made his arrest absent probable cause; unreasonably seized his person
- b. used excessive force in arresting him
- c. denied him medical treatment at the scene

Second Count:

Violation of 42 U.S.C. 1983 by Defendants Kinirey and Morrison

- 30. The plaintiff restates and realleges the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 29 and incorporates herein as paragraph 30.
- 31. By the actions described in paragraphs 1 through 27, the defendants violated the plaintiff's constitutional rights as guaranteed by the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution as follows:
- a. lodging and prosecuting charges against him which they knew to be false

Third Count:

Violation of 42 U.S.C. 1983 by Defendant (The Police Chief)

- 32. The plaintiff restates and realleges the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 31 and incorporates herein as paragraph 32.
- 33. By the actions described in paragraphs 1 through 27, the defendant William E. May violated the plaintiff's constitutional rights as guaranteed by the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution as follows:
- a. failing to train and supervise his officers on the proper use of force

Fourth Count

Violation of M.G.L. c. 12, § 11 I

- 34. The plaintiff restates and realleges the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 33 and incorporates herein as paragraph 34.
- 35. By the actions described in paragraphs 1 through 27, the defendants violated the plaintiff's civil rights by force,

intimidation, and violence in violation of M. G. L. c. 12, § 11 I.

Fifth Count

Violation of M.G.L. 258 A by Defendant Town of Townsend

36. The plaintiff restates and realleges the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 35 and incorporates herein as paragraph 36.

The acts and omissions of defendants as described in paragraphs 1 through 27 constitute negligence.

- 37. On October 9, 2002, a notice of Claim pursuant to M.G.L. 258 § 4 was presented by certified mail to the Board of Selectmen, Town of Townsend. The Selectmen received the Notice of the letter on on October 10, 2002
- 38. The Town responded and in sum stated that the police officers, and the police department, and the Town acted properly and without error in connection to the arrest, treatment, and prosecution of plaintiff LaFrenier.
- 39. As a direct and proximate result of the defendant's negligence the plaintiff suffered the damages previously described herein.

Sixth Count

Assault and Battery

- 40. The plaintiff restates and realleges the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 39 and incorporates herein as paragraph 40.
- 41. By the actions described in paragraphs 1 through 27, the defendants Kinirey and Morrison committed assaults and batteries on the plaintiff LaFrenier.

Seventh Count

False arrest

- 42. The plaintiff restates and realleges the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 41 and incorporates herein as paragraph 42.
- 43. By the actions described in paragraphs 1 through 27, the defendants Kinirey and Morrison committed a false arrest against the plaintiff LaFrenier.

Eight Count

Abuse of Process

- 44. The plaintiff restates and realleges the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 43 and incorporates herein as paragraph 44.
- 45. By the actions described in paragraphs 1 through 27, the defendants Kinirey and Morrison committed an abuse of process against plaintiff LaFrenier.

Wherefore, the plaintiff requests this Court:

- 1. Award compensatory damages against the defendants jointly and severally;
- 2. Award punitive damgages against defendant Kinirey, Morrsion, and the Police Chief;
- 3. Award the costs of this litigation, including reasonable attorneys fees;
- 4. Award such other and further relief as this court may deem necessary and appropriate.

A JURY TRIAL IS HEREBY DEMANDED

Respectfully submitted

Carol T. Vittorioso, Attorney

Vittorioso & Taylor Leominster MA 01534 Tel. no. 978 537-3500

B.B.O. no. 560046 Date: June 14, 2004

Case 4:04-cv-40114-FDS Document 1 Filed 06/14/2004 Page 7 of 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICTOR MASSACULETS UNITED STATES DISTRICTOR MASSACULETS

۱.	Title of case (nat	ne of first party Ann	on each s KIN	side only)_ 1	TIM	07hy (aFIX	nie	<u> </u>	
2.	Category in which the case belongs based upon the numbered nature of suit code listed on the civil cover sheet. (See local rule 40.1(a)(1)).										
	L	160, 410, 470,	R.23, RE	GARDLESS	OF NA	TURE OF SUIT					
	X	195, 368, 400, 740, 790, 791,		-	mplete AO 120 or AO 121 nt, trademark or copyright cases						
	fft.		340, 345			245, 290, 310, 365, 370, 371,					
	IV.	220, 422, 423, 690, 810, 861				630, 640, 650,	660,				
	V.	150, 152, 153									
	Title and number district please in	ndicate the title a	and numb	per of the fir	rst filed (ase in this co	urt. 	- 4			
٦.	tias a prior activ		Janto part				YES		NO	Ø.	
5.	Does the complaint in this case question the constitutionality of an act of congress affecting the public interest? (See 28 USC §2403)										
	If so, is the U.S.	A. or an officer,	agent or	employee c	of the U.S	S. a party?	YES		NO	X	
							YES		NO		
6.	Is this case req	uired to be heard	d and dete	ermined by	a distric	t court of thre	e judge	es pursuai	nt to title	28 USC §228	1?
							YES		NO	囟	
7.	Do <u>afl</u> of the par Massachusetts	Do <u>all</u> of the parties in this action, excluding governmental agencies of the united states and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts ("governmental agencies"), residing in Massachusetts reside in the same division? - (See Local Rule 40.1(d))									
							YES		МО		
	Α.	If yes, in whi	ch divisio	on do <u>all</u> of	the non-	governmental	parties	reside?			
		Eastern Divi	sion [Cer	itral Division			Wes	tern Division	
	₿.	If no, in which division do the majority of the plaintiffs or the only parties, excluding governmenta agencies, residing in Massachusetts reside?									ental
		Eastern Divi	sion [Cei	ntral Division			Wes	tern Division	
8.	. If filing a Notice submit a separ	e of Removal - a ate sheet identif			pending	j in the state c	ourt re	quiring th	e attentio	on of this Cou	rt? (If yes,
							YES		NO		
•	PLEASE TYPE OR	PRINT)	we T	VITT	07/69	5 0					
	DDRESS 6	1Dates	/ /	5+	120	minst	21	M	: #A		
^	ELEPHONE NO.	17	53		100				-		<u>-</u>

Case 4:04-cv-40114-FB\$VIDocumentER 5Hed 66/14/2004 Page 8 of 8

The JS = 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained begin neither replace nor supplement the tiny and over total edities or other supers. The quit by Liw except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the Greek States of September 1974, is required for the court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket street. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS I MO TY V (b) COUNTY OF HESIDENCE O (EXCEPT		vorcoste		(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASE MNATION CASES USE THE LOC				
(C) ATTORNEYS ITSPANNAME CAROL A VIHORIOSO + 19 Water	ADDRESS AND TELEPHONE N VI HOPLOSO Taylor St Leon	uinste 1	nvA	ATTOENETS OF KNOWNS					
II. BASIS OF JURISD			III. CIT			LACE AN "X" IN ONE BOX FOR PLAINTI			
			(For	Diversity Cases Only) P	rf DEF	AND ONE BOX FOR DEFENDANT) PTF DE1			
☐ + U.S. Government			Citizen of This State 13.1 (3.1 Incorporated or Principal Place 13.4 (3.4 of Business In This State						
□ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	□ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizer	ship of Parties	Citizen of Another State □ 2 □ 2 Incorporated <i>and</i> Principal Place □ 5 □ 5 of Business In Another State						
	in Item III)		C	Citizen or Subject of a ⊔ - Foreign Country	3 📋 з Foreign Natio	Foreign Nation [] 6 [] 6			
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (PLACE AN "X" IN ON	E BOX ONLY)		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
CONTRACT	_ `	ORTS		FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES			
Proceeding Stat VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	e Court Appe DN (cite the u.s. civil sta bo not cite jurisdic	anded from ellate Court TUTE UNDER WHICH	ory action of the control of the con	ned (specify) HING AND WRITE BRIEF STATEME	FEDERAL TAX SUITS () 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) () 871 IRS - Third Party 26 USC 7609 ed from district	Appeal to District Undge from			
VII. REQUESTED IN				DEMAND S		only if demanded in complaint:			
COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS I UNDER FRICIPI	S A CLASS ACT 23	TION		JURY DEMA	k			
VIII.RELATED CASE((S) (See instructions):	UDGE			DOCKET NUMBER				
DATE	~········	SIGNATURE OF A	TI TORNEY:	OF RECORD		· <u></u> ·			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY									

RECEIPT AMOUNT APPLICACION JULIOE MAG PANE